

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is requested.

Claims 9, 11-15 and 17-19 are now in the application. Claims 9, 11-15 and 17-19 are subject to examination. Claims 9, 11, 12, and 19 have been amended. Claim 10 has been canceled to facilitate prosecution of the instant application.

Under the heading "Claim Objections" on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, the Examiner objected to claims 9-15 and 17-19 because of a informality.

The Examiner stated that the terms "a hollow-cylindrical basic body formed with a substantially continuous outer circumferential wall having a front end facing a switching path of the switching device" are unclear.

The objectionable limitation, "facing a switching path of the switching device" has been deleted. This limitation is not believed to be relevant to patentability.

In the event the Examiner should still find the language objectionable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that acceptable language can be worked out.

For example, if the Examiner prefers that the claim include some language specifying the location of the front end, perhaps the following language would

be acceptable: at least one of said rated current contact pieces having a hollow-cylindrical basic body formed with a substantially continuous outer circumferential wall having a front end facing the other one of said rated current contact pieces.”

Under the heading “Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103” on page 2 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 9, 10, 12-14, 17 and 18 have been rejected as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,211,478 to Schoenemann et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,504,906 to Tremblay under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Please see the discussion related to the allowable subject matter that is provided below.

Under the heading “Allowable Subject Matter” on page 4 of the above-identified Office Action, claims 11, 15, and 19 have been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The indication of Allowability is appreciated. The limitations of claim 11 have been added to claim 9. Claim 19 has been rewritten in independent form. The objectionable limitation, “facing a switching path of the switching device” has been deleted. This limitation is not believed to be relevant to patentability.

It is accordingly believed to be clear that none of the references, whether taken alone or in any combination, either show or suggest the features of claims 9 or 19. Claims 9 and 19 are, therefore, believed to be patentable over the art. The dependent claims are believed to be patentable as well because they all are ultimately dependent on claim 9.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and allowance of claims 9, 11-15 and 17-19 are solicited.

In the event the Examiner should still find any of the claims to be unpatentable, counsel would appreciate receiving a telephone call so that, if possible, patentable language can be worked out.

Please charge any fees that might be due with respect to Sections 1.16 and 1.17 to the Deposit Account of Lerner Greenberg Stermer LLP, No. 12-1099.

Respectfully submitted,

/Mark P. Weichselbaum/
Mark P. Weichselbaum
(Reg. No. 43,248)

MPW:cgm

July 1, 2009

Lerner Greenberg Stermer LLP
P.O. Box 2480
Hollywood, Florida 33022-2480
Tel.: (954) 925-1100; Fax: (954) 925-1101